

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 28 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. This contention is respectfully traversed, since claims 27 and 28 define additional functions of "said telephone function". The base claim 13 specifies that the telephone function controls placing a telephone call, while claims 27 and 28 define that the telephone function also controls an attendant. Claims 27 and 28 are amended into independent form herein, since the rejection of the remaining claims is not being addressed.

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This contention is respectfully traversed, since paragraph 35 of the specification describes that "Once the call is placed, the user can be immediately connected to the call, or the attendant can act as a secretary at 310... For example, if Bob works at a location where either ,an automated attendant is necessary, or it is necessary to enter an extension, or calling somewhere to see if Bob is there, then the attendant can do

the work...”, making it clear that the attendant will dial the extension, as needed.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Mahoney in view of Shank et al. (US 6,965,925).

This contention is respectfully traversed, since nothing in Mahoney teaches an automated attendant, as the patent office agrees. The secondary reference to Shank describes a media service and telephony service, however nothing in Shank describes an automated attendant that answers for the stored contact information. Shank describes in general that there are telephony services, but says nothing about such an automated attendant.

Claim 28 was not rejected over prior art, and should hence be allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview

or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response, (excluding those concurrently paid via EFS), to Deposit Account No. 50-1387.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/9/2012

/Scott C Harris/

Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 23844
Scott C. Harris, Esq.
Law Office of Scott C. Harris, Inc.

SCHIPLAW

P.O. Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

P 858 756 7778
F 858 756 7717

M 619 823 7778

E harris@schiplaw.com
www.schiplaw.com